

BEEF COURT'S FINDINGS

SOME OF THE CONCLUSIONS REGARDED
AS UNFORTUNATE

NATURE OF THE REPORT LONG AGO KNOWN
TO WAR DEPARTMENT BUREAUCRATS--
ONE MEMBER, JESSIE JENNISON

HOSTILITY TO GEN-
ERAL MILES.
[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]
Washington, May 8.—The report of the Beef
Court of Inquiry is not being received by the
public here with that unquestioning faith
which a report made under the peculiar circum-
stances that this was should be. It is unfortu-
nate, to begin with, that the findings of the
Court were substantially known in all well-in-

lated. A pretty correct forecast, indeed, of what the report would be was made in the pulpit prints within two weeks after the Court had met. Those in the confidence of the War Department bureaucracy discussed months ago with cynical indifference and with a faith that seemed deeply rooted the outcome long before one-third of the testimony had been heard. To most people the result was a foregone conclusion.

tion. This was decidedly unfortunate.

THE CRITICISM OF MAUS AND MILES.

More unfortunate than this, however, is the condemnation of Colonel Maus, which is by many people considered indicative of the spirit which animated the Court. Colonel Maus is severely criticised by the Court for failing to draw the attention of the proper authorities to the report made by Dr. Daly at Chickamauga. Yet the same Court finds no word of criticism for Colonel O. M. Smith for failing to report the purchase by General Eagan of part of 2,750,272

inspection whatever, in the open market, at prices which for the same grade fluctuated as between different lots in the most unaccountable man-

On the contrary, while the testimony of Colonel Smith clearly showed that many of these purchases were made in Chicago by General Eagan without Colonel Smith's knowledge—at least were not made known to him until after the transaction had been closed—the Court finds that they were "being made in every case by officers of his (the Commissary-General's) Department in the usual manner." This extraordinary disposition, however, to close its eyes to

In the case of Colonel Maus. The latter is an aide-de-camp to General Miles, and was one of the many witnesses whom the General com-

the Court declined to summon. The criticism of Colonel Maus, therefore, administered by the Court so publicly and without affording the officer criticised an opportunity of being heard, is by outsiders considered not to belong to that category of "proprietaries" the observance of which, in the somewhat pompous words of the Court, should "dignify high military command."

not reporting sooner than he did the unsatisfactory condition of the refrigerated beef on its arrival in Porto Rico. It is compelled, however, to note the receipt of a dispatch from General Miles, dated August 2, in which he requested the discontinuance of beef shipments, as the island furnished an abundant beef supply. As a

On July 20, 1962, General Soto had already sent a dispatch containing a similar request on July 20. This latter dispatch, however, the Department says was never received. Yet, though it admits receiving the dispatch of August 2, it sent another cargo of refrigerated beef three days later, on August 5. To the court this seems the most natural thing in the world. To the outsider it looks as if this beef, which was not wanted at Ponce, might just as well have gone to Santiago. Why it was not sent there, instead of to Porto Rico, no one has yet explained.

"ARMY AND NAVY REGISTER'S" VIEWS. What a large and influential proportion of the Army really believes to have been proved by the testimony offered appears in the current issue of "The Army and Navy Register." "The Register" is a weekly of the highest standing.

fecting the opinion of the two military branches of the Government. Although an unofficial publication, its character and reputation dispel any doubt of its great influence among the officers of the Army and Navy, to whom its circulation is largely confined. That it would print anything which might be obnoxious or even mildly dis-

The report of the Wade Court of Inquiry is now before the President. Many guesses have been made as to the result of the inquiry. Most of them are obviously prejudiced. The following conclusions can be safely drawn from the evidence before the

First—That chemicals had been used in attempted preservation of fresh meats, both in this and foreign countries, for at least fifteen years prior to the Spanish war (see the testimony of Dr. Hildekoper); also, that chemicals under various names are manufactured in large quantities in this country, the chief customers or buyers thereof being

Second—That the use of some chemical was depended upon by the successful bidder in fulfilling his contract to supply the Army during the war

Third—All expert witnesses agree that refrigerated beef would not keep more than a very few hours in a climate like that of Florida, Porto Rico or Cuba after being taken from the refrigerator. (See letter of Dr. Huldekeoper and others.)

Fourth—That the practice of treating it with chemicals prevailed to a very great extent. (See testimony of Dr. E. P. Murdock, of Chicago, Ill.)

Fifth—The treatment of meat with chemicals was shown by the discoverer of the process, who processed beef at Armour's stockyards in a car billed for Tampa, Fla. (See testimony of Alexander B. Howell and V. M. Fleischman.)

Sixth—That in the letting of the contract for supplying fresh beef to the troops in camp and field it

Seventh—That at the time of making the award it was understood that the fresh beef intended to be furnished would necessarily have to be processed or chemically treated in order to preserve it after it left cold storage. (See letter of Dudley & Michener

Eight—That the contracts for supplying the army with fresh beef contemplated the use of semicals is confirmed by the admissions of the agent of Armour & Co., at Lakeland, Fla., while engaged in the business of his principal, to wit, furnishing a portion of the Army with fresh beef, a saving that the beef had been treated with a

which was unknown to him. (See testimony of Captain Charles H. Castle, assistant surgeon; Lieutenant Gampfer, acting brigade commissary; John Cuch, company cook, and Sergeant Edward Mason, 1st Cavalry, acting commissary sergeant.)

Ninth—That the beef actually issued to the troops or near Jacksonville, Fla., was treated with harmful chemicals is shown by the illness of eighty-four men out of a total of 108 who ate of it. That the chemical analysis of this beef showed the

Fifth.—That on board the transport *Manitoba* the transported fresh beef was so offensive to the senses

characteristic of an embalmed body. No natural composition. Those who ate of it were made sick—gripping pains in the alimentary tract, vomit-

Eleventh—That, in addition to the chemically